8135. b. 20.

DEFENCE

OF THE

RIGHTS OF MAN;

BEING A

DISCUSSION

OF THE

CONCLUSIONS

DRAWN FROM THOSE RIGHTS

BY MR. PAINE.

" What in my ſecret ſoul is underſtood,
" My words ſhall utter, and my deeds make good."

ILIAD, B. IX. v. 408.

LONDON:
PRINTED FOR T. EVANS,
IN PATER-NOSTER-ROW.
M DCC XCI.

47
10 1 9
213

PREFACE.

A DEMONSTRATION can derive no merit from the name of him who demonſtrates, and is of equal force whether the Author were a Boy at School or Sir Iſaac Newton. The moſt eſſential parts of this Pamphlet are of the nature of a mathematical demonſtration. Whatever can be demonſtrated does not require the aid of eloquence or rhetoric; the reaſoning contained in the following ſheets, and the grounds upon which that reaſoning is built, are ſubmitted to the moſt rigid examination; but it is hoped the Reader will not expect elegant language.

DEFENCE

OF THE

RIGHTS OF MAN.

LIBERTY, Property, Security, and the Reſiſtance of Oppreſſion, which are declared to be the Rights of Man by the French National Aſſembly, are enjoyed, in the fulleſt ſenſe of the words, by every Engliſhman, while they are moſt flagrantly trampled upon in France. We ſhall demonſtrate, that the principal points of Mr. Paine's doctrine are perfectly repugnant to this definition of the Rights of Man, quoted by himſelf from the declaration of the National Aſſembly.

We ſhall lay open the foundation of the edifice, and ſhew our readers, that, where the building is real, it neither ſtands upon the Rights of Man, nor on any other principle; and that, where the Rights

of Man, or any admitted truth, are the foundation, the ſuperſtructure, which impoſed upon the diſtant ſpectator, proves to be nothing, when examined nearly, but a piece of ſcenery.

Mr. Paine ſays, page 11, "There never did, "there never will, there never can, exiſt a Par- "liament, or any deſcription of men, or any ge- "neration of men, in any country, poſſeſſed of "the right or the power of binding and controul- "ing poſterity to the end of time, or of com- "manding for ever how the world ſhall be go- "verned, or who ſhall govern it; and therefore "all ſuch clauſes, acts, or declarations, by which "the makers of them attempt to do what they "have neither the right nor the power to do, nor "the power to execute, are in themſelves null "and void. Every age and generation muſt be "as free to act for itſelf, in all caſes, as the ages "and generations which preceded it."

According to Mr. Paine, though the wiſeſt men of a country ſhould agree in opinion, that the beſt way to ſecure the peace and happineſs of poſterity and their exiſtence as a nation is to form a permanent conſtitution, ſo ſecured by laws and oaths as not to be ſuſceptible of alteration in any thing eſſential; yet thoſe wiſe men ought not to perſuade their contemporaries to form ſuch a conſtitution, becauſe, according to him, they have no right to provide for the peace and happineſs of their poſterity, or their exiſtence as a nation. He

ays, in the next page, "That which a whole na-"tion chooſes to do, it has a right to do." And here he ſays, "Every age and generation muſt be "as free to act for itſelf, in all caſes, as the ages "and generations which preceded it." Should a whole nation chooſe to eſtabliſh ſuch a conſtitution as may preclude future diſſenſions and civil wars, by obliging their repreſentatives to ſwear that they will maintain the eſtabliſhed form of government, and by enacting laws to puniſh ſedition and rebellion; that nation has, Mr. Paine admits, a right to do ſo, becauſe it is "what it chooſes to "do." But if every age and generation is as "free "to act for itſelf, in all caſes, as the age and ge-"nerations which preceded it," then, whatever laws or oaths reſtrain it from overturning the eſtabliſhed conſtitution ought to be broken. It were no wonder, that one, who profeſſes to juſtify the late proceedings in France, ſhould avow himſelf to be the advocate of perjury as well as of robbery and murder. We do not pretend to convince thoſe who juſtify crimes on account of their conſequences. This diſcuſſion is only intended for men of honeſt and honourable ſentiments.

Not to inſiſt more upon this abſurdity, let us explain Mr. Paine's meaning in a more rational way than his expreſſion admits of, and ſuppoſe a nation without a conſtitution, ſo as to be at liberty to chooſe one for itſelf. As there are at all times living together, in every country, people of the

ages of twenty, thirty, forty, fifty, ſixty, ſeventy, eighty, and upwards, we wiſh Mr. Paine had determined which of all theſe different ages are the men of the preſent generation; for as the man of twenty may vote with the man of eighty at the forming of the firſt conſtitution, and may himſelf vote afterwards, at the age of eighty, with men of twenty, it ſeems difficult to decide the time when the new generation comes on with power to chooſe a new form of government. If Mr. Paine means, that all thoſe who formed the firſt conſtitution ſhould be extinct before a new one could be formed, one man living to the age of a hundred or more might deprive millions of ever enjoying that valuable part of the Rights of Man, the power of changing the conſtitution.

There remains but one other way of explaining what Mr. Paine means by every age and generation being free to act for itſelf, which is, that at all times, if the majority of a nation ſhould chooſe to eſtabliſh a new form of government, they have a right to do ſo. Without entering into a diſcuſſion concerning the right, let us examine whether or not, ſuppoſing it to exiſt, that only kind of government which Mr. Paine allows to be without deſpotiſm would reſult from it.

Whoever will take the trouble to examine the Bills of Mortality of London, or any other town, for a number of years, will find, that more than three-fourths of the men who attain the age of twenty

twenty years die under fifty. Conſequently, there muſt, at all times, be near three-fourths of the people under the age of fifty years. Therefore, ſuppoſing a new kind of government to be formed in any country in the year 1800, thoſe who form it binding themſelves by an oath as Mr. Paine's friends in France have done, but leaving the ſucceeding generation free to act for themſelves according to his idea of the Rights of Man, only about a fourth part of thoſe who choſe this form of government will be alive in the year 1830, ſo that the majority of the people will conſiſt of men who were under age when that government was eſtabliſhed, and who, being "as free to act for "themſelves as the preceding generation," may aboliſh that form of government and eſtabliſh a new one; conſequently, all the men of fifty years of age and upwards muſt paſs the remainder of their days under a government impoſed upon them againſt their will, and in their own life-time, by younger men. If "the preclusion of conſent is "deſpotiſm," as Mr. Paine terms it, (p. 134,) what is this?

Should his meaning be, that a majority is not ſufficient and that the whole nation muſt be unanimous, this infallible conſequence muſt follow, that a few of thoſe, who eſtabliſhed the firſt form of government, living to the age of a hundred, will prevent a new government being formed for the ſpace of eighty years, in which period nine-

tenths

tenths of thoſe who were born under the firſt form of government will likewiſe die under it, and never enjoy Mr. Paine's Rights of Man. While thoſe old men remain in life, ſuppoſing even that they ſhould think their grandſons wiſer than they were themſelves, they cannot conſent to a new form of government without breaking their oath *; conſequently the whole nation cannot be unanimous (ſuppoſing the caſe poſſible in other reſpects), while they remain in life. The ſuppoſition of unanimity being neceſſary is therefore quite contrary to Mr. Paine's ſyſtem of government, becauſe, excepting a few individuals, the whole nation would live and die under a government formed without their conſent; which, according to his own doctrine, is deſpotiſm.

We have already proved, that, if the conſent of a majority is ſufficient to change the government, all the men, of the age of fifty and upwards, are expoſed to have a new government impoſed upon them againſt their will in their own life-time; which is a ſtill greater degree of deſpotiſm.

If, in aſſerting that "every age and generation "is as free to act for itſelf in all caſes as the ages "and generations which preceded it," Mr. Paine neither means the whole nation, nor a great ma-

* As Mr. Paine does not expreſsly ſay, that to break an oath is one of the Rights of Man, we muſt ſuppoſe that he allows perjury to be a crime.

jorityy

jority of the nation, at any time, we leave it to the reader of inventive genius to turn this fundamental maxim of his into any ſhape that will produce common ſenſe; for every light that we can place it in ſhews nothing but abſurdity.

It is allowed that Mr. Paine's deciſion, beginning with "There never did, there never will, "there never can, exiſt, &c." ſounds ſomething like reaſon when it is paſſed over without examination; but, if the reader has attended to what we have demonſtrated, he muſt be convinced that Mr. Paine has either a very ſhallow underſtanding for a man who profeſſes to teach and correct one of our wiſeſt ſenators; or that he himſelf muſt have known the abſurdity, as well as the villainous tendency, of his pretended Rights of Man.

When a government is elective, and a whole nation the electors, let the election be carried by ever ſo great a majority, thoſe who loſe it have a government impoſed upon them againſt their will by their own contemporaries. And, ſhould they carry their point the next election, thoſe who carried the former one fall then into the ſame ſituation; ſo that, if government without conſent be deſpotiſm, as Mr. Paine terms it, there can be no government whatever without deſpotiſm, till ſuch time as there ſhall exiſt a nation all of one mind.

In every republican conſtitution, part of the people have a government impoſed upon them againſt their will by their contemporaries. An hereditary

government,

government, though it exiſts without the choice of any, is equal to all. It was provided for the "preſent generation," to uſe Mr. Paine's expreſſion, before their birth, by thoſe who gave them or their parents that birth, and cannot be overturned while the great body of the people conſiſts chiefly of honeſt men endued with common ſenſe; which we hope will always be the caſe with the Engliſh nation, in ſpite of the eagerneſs of libel-writers, and their abettors, to inſpire them with villainy and madneſs.

The moſt eſtimable part of the French nation now feel all the rigour of deſpotiſm, and have been deprived of what the National Aſſembly have ſince declared to be the Rights of Man. The commonality of France are the reverſe of thoſe of England in every reſpect. The people of Paris in particular required a conſtant exertion of power to preſerve peace and order amongſt them. It is ſpeaking within bounds to ſay, that fifty murders were committed there to one in London. They were without any ſentiment of honeſty; and, amongſt the military of France, Pariſian was a term of reproach. The French nobleſſe, that is, the families which have been from time immemorial in poſſeſſion of almoſt all the lands in the kingdom, were of as different a character as poſſible, generous, brave, full of ſentiments of honour, benevolent, and polite, eſpecially to ſtrangers.

This

This is not an idea formed by a traveller who, having only poſted through France, and ſeen the great circles of Paris, judges of the character of the French nobles from what is in general the worſt ſample of them (it being allowed that the greater nobleſſe had degenerated conſiderably ſince the reign of Louis the Fourteenth); it is a fact, well known to one who has paſſed moſt of his life time in France, and ſome years of it at Paris, Verſailles, and the neighbourhood.

Thoſe who look upon the privileges enjoyed by the nobleſſe of France as ſo great a hardſhip on the commonality, are not aware that they were in general very poor *, a neceſſary conſequence of their numbers, which could alone have formed a great army; that they were debarred from all lucrative profeſſions or employments, and from trade; that the order of the nobleſſe furniſhed officers to the whole French army (the foreign regiments excepted), and that they ſerved chiefly at their own expence; that the exiſtence of France as a nation depends upon its land-forces, which muſt become much more expenſive to the ſtate when the officers no longer ſerve from a principle of honour, and at their own charges; ſo that the commonality can reap no real advantage from hav-

* For one family of the French nobleſſe, whoſe revenue exceeded five hundred pounds ſterling, we may ſafely aver that ten families had leſs.

ing robbed the nobles of what they inherited from thoſe anceſtors, who have ever been the chief bulwark of the French Nation, at the expence of their blood and fortunes.

Mr. Paine ſays, p. 50, "The Moſaic account of the creation, whether taken as divine authority, or merely hiſtorical, is full to this point, the unity or equality of man. The expreſſion admits of no controverſy. 'And God ſaid, let us make man in our own image. In the image of God created he him; male and female created he them."

That the equality of men is proved from the unity of man at his creation ſeems the ſame thing as if one attempted to prove that ſomething was white by producing an evidence of its being black. For, if ſeveral men had been created at once, they might have been equal; but, ſince there was only one man created, his ſons could not poſſibly be equal to him, neither could any of his poſterity, who, till ſuch time as they became wicked and depraved, muſt have ſubmitted to his government ſo long as he lived, and that through a gradation of ranks much greater than what Mr. Paine charges Mr. Burke with placing betwixt man and his Maker, for the duty which every man owed to his immediate father, made the whole race ſubject to their common anceſtor, who was, as long as he lived, their natural king and governor, from whom they have derived all the rights they could have,

and

and even their exiſtence*. The ſons of Noah lived to ſee many generations of their deſcendants, and were the natural rulers and judges of their own poſterity. When their different branches ſeparated, and ſettled in different countries, ſingle families became in time great nations, which is a neceſſary conſequence of what Mr. Paine admits, the derivation of the whole human race from one man. The father of each of thoſe ſeparate families was its natural judge and ruler, whether it conſiſted of many generations, as muſt have been the caſe for ſeveral hundred years after the deluge, or only of one or two. Whatever was eſtabliſhed by thoſe patriarchs, their poſterity thought themſelves bound in duty to follow; and that they left to their eldeſt ſon the dominion over the reſt of their poſterity is clear from the authority by which Mr.

* The longevity of the antediluvians, though we had not ſo good authority for believing it, is no matter of wonder to any one who takes the trouble to reflect, that the lives of all creatures depend chiefly upon the temperature of the air, and that a great change was occaſioned in that element by the univerſal deluge, which produced a proportionable change in the life of man; not all at once, but as plants, brought from the country where they grow in perfection to a bad ſoil and climate, degenerate by degrees, till they come to the ſtandard of ſuch as that bad ſoil produces; ſo the longevity of mankind continued for ſome time after the deluge till it came to the preſent ſtandard, which, though different in different countries, ſeems to have been the ſame in general as it is now for the laſt three thouſand years.

Paine attempts to prove, "that the equality of "man, ſo far from being a modern doctrine, is the "oldeſt upon record *," viz. the Book of Geneſis: "Be lord over thy brethren, and let thy mother's "ſons bow down to thee †," is the teſtament of Iſaac in favour of the perſon whom he believed to be his eldeſt ſon.

What has been already ſhewn, that ſingle families becoming nations was a neceſſary conſequence of the derivation of the human race from one man, and that the right of primogeniture which ſubſiſted in the family continued when it grew into a nation, is further confirmed by the traces of the ſame conſtitution, obſervable in thoſe few countries that have remained unconquered and unmixed with foreigners. There we find thouſands of people deriving themſelves from the ſame family, and acknowledging the head or ſtem of that family as their rightful ruler and commander, even where they are not in any degree dependant on him. The pooreſt claſs of the people trace back their pedigree for ſeveral generations, and, though the branch from which they are derived ſhould have ſprung from the ſtem a thouſand years ago, they ſtill retain the ſame reſpect and attachment to him whom they conſider as the rightful head of the whole.

* Rights of Man, p. 50.

† Geneſis, chap. xxvii. v. 29.

This

This cuſtom of all claſſes of people preſerving their pedigrees as well as the great, and of the heads or chiefs having authority each over his tribe, we find to have prevailed amongſt the Iſraelites. "And they aſſembled all the congregation "together on the firſt day of the ſecond month, "and they declared their pedigrees after their fa-"milies, by the houſe of their father, according to "the number of names, &c.*"

And in another place: "That the princes of "Iſrael, heads of the houſe of their fathers (who "were the princes of the tribes, and were over "them that were numbered) offered †."

The ſame diſtinction of tribes and families, under their natural hereditary princes or heads, ſtill ſubſiſts among the Arabs, they never having been conquered or mixed with other nations; and it is not quite worn out in thoſe parts of this iſland, where the original race of inhabitants ſtill remains, and where the radical ideas and principles ſtill ſubſiſt in ſome degree.

Mr. Paine produces no example or authority whatever concerning the origin of government, except a quotation from the Book of Geneſis, which quotation clearly proves the reverſe of what he calls the Equality of Man. Here we have proved, from the ſame authority, that, in the

* Numbers, chap. i. v. 18.

† Numbers, chap. vii. v. 2.

firſt

firſt ages of the world, the only government that could ſubſiſt was Monarchy, with a greater chain of ſubordination than is to be found in any country now. The father being ſuperior to the ſons, the ſons to the grandſons, the grandſons to the great-grandſons, &c.

This government aroſe from none of the three ſources from which Mr. Paine (p. 59.) thinks that all governments muſt have ariſen; for it was neither from ſuperſtition, nor from power, nor from what he calls the common Rights of Man.

It was not a government of prieſtcraft, nor of conquerors; but it may come under the head of what he calls a Government of Reaſon, becauſe it was a Government of Duty. We have ſhewn that traces of the ſame government of filial duty are ſtill to be found in ſome parts of the world, where a whole race look upon it as their duty to honour and obey that head, on whom, by the deſtination of their common anceſtor, the rights which he poſſeſſed devolved. This is a living teſtimony, that the firſt governments were families increaſed into nations, and adhering to the right of primogeniture eſtabliſhed by their common anceſtor.

Mr. Paine ſays, "The fact muſt be, that the "individuals themſelves, each in his own perſonal "and ſovereign right, entered into a compact with "each other to produce a government." This might have have been the caſe if, according to the Grecian fables, whole nations grew up at once from

from dragons' teeth ſown in the ground, or from ants ſwarming on the aged oak; but the ſyſtem cannot be reconciled with the derivation of the human race from one man, which Mr. Paine admits, and from which this neceſſary conſequence follows, that the firſt government was Monarchy, not eſtabliſhed by force or by compact, but by filial duty, which ſuperſedes all human inſtitutions, being the law of God and of Nature.

But filial duty ſeems to be what Mr. Paine does not admit; for, if every generation was free to act for itſelf, as he aſſerts (though from no authority but his own), ſons may break through the will and teſtament of their fathers, becauſe, without that, they cannot act for themſelves.

The ſettlement of the Crown, in 1701, upon one of the branches of the Royal Family, was part of the will and teſtament of thoſe who made that ſettlement. What Mr. Paine calls the ſituation of King, with all the rights and revenues belonging to it, became then the lawful inheritance of that family, as much as what the ſame perſons ſettled upon their children or other heirs became the inheritance of thoſe children or heirs. Therefore, leaving out of the queſtion for a moment the laws for the puniſhment of perjury and treaſon, all that Mr. Paine wiſhes to impoſe upon the publick as reaſoning, concerning the Rights of Man, with reſpect to changing a conſtitution, is abſolutely inconſequential; for he himſelf and his friends in

France declare, that Liberty, Property, Security, and Reſiſtance of Oppreſſion, are the natural and impreſcriptible Rights of Man. So he either involves himſelf into an evident contradiction, or means that a Royal Family has no inheritance; or that, in a country where kingly government ſubſiſts, there is one family not entitled to the Rights of Man, which he would perhaps prove to be inferior to all other families by their being ſuperior to them all, in the ſame way of reaſoning that he proves the equality of men by their inequality. Moſt of his reaſoning, if ſifted and diſcuſſed in the ſame manner, would produce nothing but ſuch abſurdities, and would only be a ſubject of laughter, did not his ſpecious language and ſophiſtry impoſe upon ſuch readers as are not at the trouble to examine him.

Should any one be at a loſs to aſſign a reaſon for the eagerneſs which Mr. Paine ſhews in attempting to deceive the people of this country, let him conſider what reaſon can be given for the eagerneſs with which ſo many modern authors, particularly in France, have laboured to make their readers doubt of a future ſtate, by which all conſolation is taken away from the unhappy and encouragement given to the viciouſly diſpoſed to yield to the bent of their minds and commit the moſt heinous crimes. What ſatisfaction ſuch authors can have is hardly to be conceived, and only

to be compared with that of the infernal ſpirit, by whom they ſeem to be inſpired.

Page 70. "The French conſtitution ſays there "ſhall be no titles, and of conſequence all that "claſs of equivocal generation which, in ſome "countries is called Ariſtocracy, and in others "Nobility, is done away, and the Peer is exalted "into Man."

Here our American Author ſhews the moſt perfect ignorance of the nature of nobility in the very country concerning which he writes; for in France the privileges of the nobility were entirely independent of titles; ſo that, had not the order of nobility been already aboliſhed, the abolition of titles would have left them much as they were. There was no privilege attached even to the title of Duke, for it was only by the erection of his lands into a "Duché Pairie" that he was a Peer of France, and many of the Dukes were not Peers. The Peers of France had a right to ſit in the Parliament of Paris, with ſome other privileges, beſides thoſe which all the French nobility enjoyed.

By the expreſſion of "the peer is exalted into man," Mr. Paine means, that a man without being a peer is a more exalted creature than a peer would be, were he not of the human ſpecies. Here we muſt allow that he reaſons very juſtly, and, in caſe any one ſhould maintain, that no ſuch thing can

be as a peer not of the human ſpecies, we muſt obſerve, in juſtice to our author, firſt, that a ſenator of Rome was a peer of the Roman empire; ſecondly, that there once was a ſenator of Rome not of the human ſpecies, for the emperor Caligula conferred the ſenatorial dignity upon a horſe; laſtly, could the emperor have afterwards metamorphoſed this new ſenator into a man, it might have been ſaid, with great propriety, "the peer is exalted "into man."

Mr. Paine ſays, page 72, "That then which is "called Ariſtocracy in ſome countries, and Nobility "in others, aroſe out of the governments founded "upon conqueſt." In confutation of this, we could bring the evidence of countries even in modern Europe, where government never was impoſed by conqueſt or by force, and where the Ariſtocracy was coëval with the Monarchy. And if our Legiſlator from America has not found ſome new lights in his own country, with regard to antient Europe, we muſt beg leave to obſerve, that, according to all the Grecian and Roman hiſtorians, that claſs of men, called Nobility, ſo odious to people who are aſhamed of their fathers or grandfathers, ſubſiſted in all the countries whereof thoſe hiſtorians make mention.

"The greateſt characters the world has produced "have riſen on the democratick floor." This I only take notice of as an aſſertion contrary to fact in

one

one light, and an abſurdity in the only other light in which it can be placed. If the author means by the democratick floor the whole nation, excepting thoſe whoſe fathers were peers, it doth indeed marvelouſly aſſiſt his argument, that a great character is not ſo likely to riſe from among two or three hundred perſons as from amongſt ſeven or eight millions. His readers are much obliged to him for the information. But, if he means that the greateſt characters have riſen from the laborious part of the community, the aſſertion is contrary to fact, for which we appeal to all hiſtory, both ancient and modern: and the reaſon is obvious; there are a few inſtances of very extraordinary geniuſes getting above all the diſadvantages of the want of education, but they are extremely rare. The working claſs of mankind, to which the other claſs bears but a ſmall proportion, cannot afford either the time or expence requiſite to form men for eccleſiaſtical and civil employments. It is a diſadvantage to any ſtate, that the claſs of men who can live without working ſhould augment in numbers at the expence of diminiſhing the claſs of working people; neither can it be of any real advantage to the individuals themſelves. No man enjoys health, ſtrength, and contentment, in a greater degree than he who lives in the natural ſtate of maintaining himſelf by his daily labour. It were certainly to be wiſhed, that every

man ſhould be able to live, in an advanced age, without working, and without depending upon his children, eſpecially if the duty of children to parents were made null and void, according to the manifeſt tendency of Mr. Paine's doctrine. But as it is very doubtful, if thoſe who, by their induſtry, or that of their parents, can live without labour, though ſtrong, and in the vigour of life, are in a happier ſtate than thoſe who are obliged to work; ſo, ſince the bulk of a nation muſt conſiſt of the working people, the beſt education their children can have is that which is beſt ſuited to their own ſtate of life. According to Mr. Paine's ſyſtem, a whole nation muſt conſiſt of ſtateſmen and philoſophers, capable to judge of forms of government, without which their right to change the conſtitution at all times, when they ſhall chooſe to try the experiment of a new one, may prove detrimental to themſelves. But in favouring us with this ſyſtem he ought at the ſame time to have taught us the ſecret of providing all the neceſſaries of life without work; for ſtateſmen and legiſlators are generally bad ploughmen and herdſmen, and but indifferent maſons, carpenters, ſmiths, weavers, or tanners. Inſtead of being bred to thoſe branches of buſineſs, the ſons of huſbandmen and tradeſpeople ought to be ſent to Oxford and Cambridge, in order to acquire the knowledge neceſſary for chooſing a new form of government, when they

they ſhall arrive at the years of being on the roll of the "preſent age and generation."

Suppoſing even that the ſtate of being able to live without working were a real advantage to an individual, yet, unleſs a whole nation could partake of that advantage, it would be an erroneous plan in a government to aim at enabling people to live without working.

Mr. Paine, (p. 37.) ſays, "It is by diſtortedly "exalting ſome men, that others are diſtortedly "debaſed till the whole is out of nature."

If any reader has aſſented to this obſervation of his, we requeſt that reader to ſee it thoroughly ſifted, and he will not find it to produce a grain of common ſenſe.

The firſt caſe in which a man may be ſaid to be exalted is, when, by the ſupreme authority, he is created a peer or raiſed to ſome other high rank or important office, whether eccleſiaſtical, civil, or military. How ſuch exaltations can debaſe any of that claſs of mankind, which, according to Mr. Paine, is "diſtinguiſhed by the appellation "of the vulgar or the ignorant mob," ſeems difficult to underſtand. When a new peer is made, others, who think they have equal or better pretenſions to that high rank, may be mortified or humbled; but how it can affect the claſs of men here deſcribed by Mr. Paine ſeems an impenetrable myſtery.

If

If his meaning is, that by ſome perſons having great fortunes, others are reduced to poverty, this has, at firſt ſight, ſome appearance of reaſon, and muſt likewiſe be examined, ſuppoſing firſt, that in a free country inequality of fortune could poſſibly be prevented. If a man, who poſſeſſes an eſtate of fifty thouſand pounds a year, could himſelf eat, drink, and wear, his whole rents, which might be ſufficient for the maintenance of hundreds, his having ſuch an eſtate might be a cauſe of poverty to many. But in reality his rents are moſtly divided amongſt people of the working claſs, employed in huſbandry, or as tradeſmen, mechanicks, or people from the ſame claſs, whom he maintains as domeſticks, or who are unable to work, and reduced to poverty, ſo that this great Proprietor has, in effect, nothing more than the power of diſtributing theſe rents.

We can find no meaning to Mr. Paine's obſervation but one or other of theſe two, both of which we have ſhewn to be deſtitute of reaſon. We believe there may be people ſo tormented with ſelfiſh pride, as to hate the ſight of any one that is more fortunate, or in a higher ſituation than themſelves. But if ſuch people feel themſelves debaſed, it is only owing to the corruption of their principles, or the illiberality of their ſentiments. The moſt noble and magnanimous characters are perfectly free from the ungenerous pride, ſelfiſh-

neſs, and envy, which thoſe, whoſe minds are corroded by ſuch malignant influence, aſcribe to a love of liberty.

There exiſts no power in this kingdom by which any man can be debaſed. A man may debaſe himſelf by his actions, or by publiſhing to the world the baſeneſs of his own mind; but no man is debaſed becauſe others are richer than he, or in a ſuperior rank of life. Such a notion is perfectly abſurd, as we have already ſhewn.

We could point out many more aſſertions contrary to fact, and falſe concluſions from real facts, in this pamphlet, but ſhall only detain the reader with one more, where Mr. Paine recommends republican government as the beſt adapted to prevent war.

"Why, ſays he, are not republicks plunged in "war, but becauſe their government does not "admit of an intereſt diſtinct from that of the "nation?"

Is it poſſible that the ſecretary for foreign affairs to the American Congreſs has never read a word of ancient or modern hiſtory? Or is he ſo eagerly bent upon deceiving the people of this country as to aſſert for a truth what he knows to be abſolutely falſe?

One or other of theſe two muſt be the caſe, as certainly as that a line muſt be either ſtraight or crooked.

To

To begin with antiquity, we beg that any reader, who has not had acceſs to books of ancient hiſtory, or leiſure to read them, would aſk the firſt ſchool-maſter or Latin ſcholar he meets, whether all ancient republicks were not conſtantly involved in war, eſpecially the greateſt, thoſe of Rome and Carthage. The Roman republick was inceſſantly involved in war during the ſpace of five hundred years, and, unluckily for Mr. Paine's argument, never had peace till the monarchical government was eſtabliſhed in the room of the republican.

The Carthaginians were continually incroaching upon other countries, and almoſt always engaged in war, as well as the Romans; with this difference, that their motive for undertaking conqueſts was avarice or the extenſion of commerce, whereas the others, who, till they began to degenerate, deſpiſed riches and luxury, fought only for dominion and the glory of the Roman name. We do not pretend to juſtify either of them; but only to ſhew, that with regard to theſe two great republicks of antiquity, the queſtion of "Why "are not republicks involved in war?" would be to aſk, Why does that happen which does not happen?

So it would be with regard to all the Grecian republicks, which were inceſſantly at war, either with

with one another, or with the Perſians, on account of their colonies in Sicily and other parts of Italy.

So it would be with regard to the republicks of Venice and Genoa, which have been almoſt conſtantly engaged in war for many ages. The Venetians, not contented with the provinces they poſſeſſed near their capital, extended their conqueſts very far both by land and ſea. If they have been more peaceable ſince the beginning of this century, it is owing to the great decay of their power and riches, as well as to the degeneracy of the people, which we are ſorry to obſerve is a more effectual cauſe of peace than either reaſon or the nature of a government.

Had Mr. Paine quoted Switzerland as a republick not much involved in war, we muſt have admitted that example as to the fact, but not in the leaſt degree the cauſe to which he aſcribes it. The Swiſs are a nation of ſoldiers, and thoſe ſoldiers are moſtly diſciplined at the expence of other ſtates. Beſides this advantage, Switzerland has that of drawing conſiderable ſupplies of money yearly, by reaſon of the troops it has in the pay of different powers; without which its currency muſt ſoon fail. It can therefore take no part in the quarrels of thoſe different powers, and no power will venture lightly to attack the Swiſs, who are at all times ready to take the field with a very great and formidable army, and whoſe country is the moſt inacceſſible of any in Europe. Theſe

are the cauſes which prevent the Swiſs republick from being engaged in war and not the nature of the republican government, which, as we have ſhewn, has never produced that effect to any ſtate whatever.

We have now to mention the only republick which Mr. Paine gives as an example to ſupport his aſſertion, " that republicks are not involved " in war, becauſe the nature of their government " does not admit of an intereſt diſtinct from that " of the nation. Even Holland, continues he, " though an ill-conſtructed republick, and with a " commerce extending over the world, exiſted " nearly a century without war."

The direct contrary of this aſſertion is literally true, for Holland was nearly a century involved in war, with the intermiſſion only of a twelve-years truce, and never had Peace ſo much as a third part of a century.

Whether or not this was owing to the nature of its government is foreign to the preſent purpoſe. Mr. Paine's aſſertion is equally ſuch a ſhameleſs impoſition upon the publick as no man would commit to print who was in the leaſt concerned for his own reputation, however depraved his ſecret ſentiments might be.

This being one of the paſſages of his pamphlet, where a keenneſs to deceive is moſt conſpicuous, we ſhall give our readers a ſummary of all the

wars

wars in which the United Netherlands have been engaged.

The hiſtory of that republick begins with a war of eighty years, without intermiſſion, excepting during a twelve-years truce concluded at the Hague in 1609.

That war was terminated by the treaty of Munſter in the year 1648; after which Holland enjoyed a peace of twenty-four years, until the invaſion by Louis XIV, in 1672; that war laſted only ſix years, having been terminated by the peace of Nymegen in 1678. After that, the republick was only eleven years in peace; for, in 1689, Great-Britain, Spain, and Holland, were united againſt France in a war which laſted eight years, and was terminated in the year 1697 by the peace of Ryſwick. After only four years of peace, Holland was involved in the war of the ſucceſſion which began in 1701, and was not terminated till 1713 by the peace of Utrecht. Then the republick enjoyed peace untill the year 1743, that is, for the ſpace of thirty years, and was engaged in war from that time to the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle in 1748. After this, leaving out of the queſtion a trifling war at the Rio-de-Berbice and Surinam, only thirty-three years elapſed untill the rupture betwixt Great-Britain and Holland. This is the longeſt peace that ever the Dutch republick enjoyed, which Mr. Paine aſſerts to have been nearly a century.

He ſays, that "the nature of a republican go-"vernment does not admit of an intereſt diſtinct "from that of the nation." We muſt therefore examine which of the two, a monarchical or republican government, admits moſt of an intereſt diſtinct from that of the nation. We ſhall leave patriotiſm out of the queſtion, and ſuppoſe men in both caſes to be actuated by their private intereſt.

The adminiſtration of the affairs of a republick muſt be placed in the hands of one or more individuals, either during life, or for a ſtated time. Theſe individuals act only as temporary ſtewards, whoſe intereſt is to make the beſt of it for themſelves during their ſtewardſhip.

The intereſt of an hereditary ſovereign is inſeparable from that of the nation; and he has not only to conſider his own welfare, but that of his family and deſcendants, whoſe honour and proſperity muſt always be inſeparable from the honour and proſperity of the nation. No individual can be ſo much intereſted as he is in the good of the people. If he has the ambition of being ſuperior to other princes, that ſuperiority can ariſe from nothing ſo much as by an augmentation of the numbers in which conſiſts the real ſtrength of the nation, and that is beſt accomplished by removing the cauſes of poverty, by purſuing ſuch plans as tend to make the people live comfortably, and by promoting morality and piety.

In

In thoſe countries where it has been in the power of kings to oppreſs the people, there certainly have been many inſtances of tyrants; but thoſe tyrants acted in direct oppoſition to their own real intereſt, and that of their family. They were generally weak princes as well as wicked.

Whatever the nature of monarchical and republican governments may ſeem to be in theory, experience has proved the direct contrary to what Mr. Paine aſſerts. Could we ſuppoſe him to have written according to the beſt of his judgement and knowledge, whoever has attended to what we have demonſtrated will allow, that he muſt have a very ſmall portion of either. If he is a man of good ſenſe, and of any degree of knowledge, he muſt have written purpoſely to deceive and pervert his readers; therefore comes under this ſentence of the divine law: "curſed is he that maketh the "blind to wander out of his way.*"

Where a conſtitution is ſo ſecured by the laws that even to propoſe overturning it is puniſhable with death, nothing but the abdication of the ſupreme magiſtrate or an open rebellion can accompliſh a revolution. When a revolution is brought about by a civil war, it is always in the power of him who has commanded the victorious army to keep the ſupreme authority in his own hands. His troops, ſo long as he provides them

* Deuteronomy, chap. xxvii. verſe 18.

with

with ſufficient pay, which he may eaſily do at the expence of the vanquiſhed, will not wiſh to be diſbanded. No one, who knows the leaſt of military affairs, will ſuppoſe that, in the preſent ſtate of things, any man who has not been bred an officer could head a rebellion; and he who betrays the confidence repoſed in him by his ſovereign, will not ſcruple to let thoſe, who looked upon him as the defender of the rights of man, remain in their error till he has eſtabliſhed his authority in ſuch a manner as to be out of the power of the people to ſhake off. In caſe the reader ſhould not immediately underſtand how this may be done, we ſhall explain it.

During the civil war he had in his power all the artillery belonging to his own party, and naturally ſeized that of the vanquiſhed; ſo that he could, without any appearance of deſign, collect all the cannon and mortars in the kingdom into ſuch places in his poſſeſſion as are already ſatisfied. Then he could conſtruct all over the kingdom ſuch fortreſſes as cannot be taken without cannon, which may be done in a very little time; he could have all the ſea-port towns under the cannon of ſuch fortreſſes, and prevent the importation of any kind of arms or artillery. His next ſtep might be to prohibit the uſe of arms to the whole inhabitants, excepting the army and navy; to order all thoſe who have arms to deliver them up at the neareſt fort; then to ſend detachments of troops

to

to make diligent ſearch for arms, and puniſh with the utmoſt rigour thoſe in whoſe houſes any are found. No poſſibility of immediate oppoſition remaining, this military government would be further ſecured by improving the temporary ſtrong holds into ſolid and permanent fortreſſes; and by erecting ſeveral well-fortified citadels near the capital, in the moſt commanding ſituations, well furniſhed with artillery.

By thoſe means the ringleader of this rebellion, if ſucceſsful, would have it in his power to exerciſe the moſt deſpotick and cruel tyranny, without a poſſibility of being reſiſted or oppoſed; and ſuch is the natural conſequence of all attempts to overturn an eſtabliſhed government, unleſs thoſe who hold the reins of government either let them go at once, or fulfil the duty of their ſtation ſo well as to cruſh the rebels, and reſtore the former peace and order. Suppoſing that a great part of the people of this country could be deluded into a belief, that the Rights of Man were not now enjoyed in their full extent by every Briton; yet it would be impoſſible to overturn the government without involving the nation in a long and bloody war, which, unleſs the iſſue was a reſtoration of the ſame government, muſt occaſion a diviſion of this iſland into two ſtates, ever at war with one another.

For there is one part of the iſland where it is not in the nature of things that ſuch a change as has

has happened lately in France can be accompliſhed. The whole lands of that country, a mere trifle excepted, are poſſeſſed by families, in general of very antient eſtabliſhment, and their branches, which are extremely numerous; there is no intermediate claſs betwixt theſe and the labouring people, who have no property, and depend upon the firſt claſs for their ſubſiſtence. The proportion of the numbers living in towns is very ſmall when compared with thoſe who live in the country, and even in moſt of the towns thoſe who have the chief ſway are perſons belonging by birth to the firſt-mentioned claſs. It was not of their own accord that the inhabitants of the low country there roſe in rebellion againſt King Charles the Firſt. The country people were raiſed by a parcel of fanaticks, whoſe lands they laboured; they might be fanaticks themſelves at the ſame time, but no one took up arms againſt the will of his lord, nor could he, but at the riſk of reducing himſelf to beggary. In the preſent caſe, Religion is out of the queſtion, ſuppoſing that any perſons of the ſuperior claſs were ignorant enough now to do, for the ſake of Chriſtianity, that which is in direct contradiction to its laws, declared in the moſt expreſs and incontrovertible terms. And any other object of a revolution is abſolutely repugnant to the intereſt as well as the ſentiments of thoſe who have alone the power of accompliſhing ſuch a thing, were they wicked enough to attempt it.

Suppoſing then, that the eaſieſt deceived, but moſt numerous, claſs of people, in one part of this iſland, were ſo far perverted by ſeditious ſermons and libels as to attempt bringing about ſuch a ſubverſion of the eſtabliſhed order of things as has taken place in France, the people of that part of the iſland here alluded to would moſt undoubtedly join thoſe who ſhould withſtand ſuch attempts, eſpecially that original and unmixed race who are ſo much averſe to change of any kind, that their very dreſs has ever remained the ſame; and that it required near ſixty years to make them acquieſce in the change, however neceſſary, which happened in 1689. Now, perfectly ſatisfied with the preſent eſtabliſhment, the ſame ſentiments that made them adhere to the cauſe of royalty in all the troubles that ever agitated their country, would make them riſe unanimouſly in arms to exterminate thoſe who ſhould attempt any thing againſt the deſcendent and ſucceſſor of that ancient race of Kings, who have preſerved them an independent and unconquered nation from the time that this iſland was firſt inhabited. What thoſe people might be capable of doing, were their tribes called to the field, each under its natural commander, may be judged of from what happened forty-ſix years ago, when a ſmall number of thoſe tribes penetrated about four hundred miles from where they firſt ſet out, overcoming every reſiſtance that could be oppoſed to them. We only mention this to ſhew

what thoſe people were; and are, in a great meaſure, far from meaning to vindicate their ideas of indefeaſible hereditary right, though we muſt at the ſame time obſerve, that thoſe who rebel againſt an eſtabliſhed government with a view to a perſonal advantage, ſuch as to extend what they are taught to look upon as their own rights, are actuated by a ſelfiſh and ignoble principle, in compariſon with thoſe who riſked their own lives and fortunes, to recover what they believed to be the rights of their friend.

From this diſcuſſion the reader will perceive that thoſe, who recommend to our imitation what has lately happened in France, are as ſhort-ſighted as they are wicked, if they do not ſee that ſuch an attempt could only end in bringing crowds of deluded people to the gibbet, or in making this country a ſcene of bloodſhed for a number of years; and, at laſt, if the rebels prevailed any where, in dividing this iſland into two, or, perhaps, three different ſtates, the ſource of endleſs wars, and very likely (conſidering the preſent ſtate of Europe) the cauſe of ſubjecting the whole to the yoke of ſome foreign power.

FINIS.